



In re application of

Jill E. WOOD et al.

Serial No.: 09/755,060

Filed: January 8, 2001

Box: PATENT APPLICATION

Group Art Unit: 1626

Examiner: F. Higel

600/2900

REPLY

INHIBITION OF RAF KINASE ACTIVITY USING ARYL UREAS

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

For:

REMARKS

The only issue outstanding in the office action mailed November 27, 2001, is the rejection of claims 18-30 under the doctrine of obviousness-double type patenting. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

While it is argued that there is "huge overlap" between the claims in the application and those of the patent, it is submitted that support of a case of obviousness-type double patenting requires reasons why the claims are <u>structurally</u> obvious, not merely argument that there is overlap. Moreover, it is submitted that the rejection is internally inconsistent, inasmuch as it does not reject claims 31 and 32 on this basis.

Thus, applicants are at a loss as to how to reply. In any event, it is submitted that mere overlap does not rise to a case of a structural obviousness sufficient to support a rejection under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Should the examiner have any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry B. Shubin, Reg. No. 32,004 Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400 2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: BAYER-1D1

Filed: May 28, 2002